HERB.

CAB INTERNATIONAL
MYCOLOGICAL INSTITUTE

IMI \Books/ DON

COMMONWEALTH MYCOLOGICAL INSTITUTE
18 MAR 1968

REINWARDTIA
Published by Herbarium Bogoriense, Kebun Raya Indonesia
Volume 1, Part 2, pp. 199-220 (1951)

THE GENERIC NAMES PROPOSED FOR HYMENOMYCETES—I "Cyphellaceae"

M. A. DONK *

SUMMARY

1. The present paper is the first of a series intended to deal from a nomenclatural point of view with all the generic names proposed for Hymenomycetes. For each name the following items are considered: (i) its etymology and gender, (ii) the original scope of the corresponding genus, and, in case of the name being an isonym, also of the group covered by its basinym; (iii) the type species, which when not originally designated, is selected; (iv) its basinym, synisonyms, homonyms, typonyms, and variant spellings, if any, are indicated; (v) its status under the Rules is determined; and (vi) supplementary remarks are given when these are deemed useful.

2. This first instalment deals with "Cyphellaceae," a group defined in a conventional, rather descriptive, manner, not as a taxonomic unit.

3. A new generic name, *Stromatoscypha* Donk, is introduced for *Porothelium* (Fr. ex Fr.) Fr.

4. The following new combinations are made: *Aleurodiscus digitalis* (A. & S. ex Fr.) Donk [basinym: *Cyphella digitalis* (A. & S.) ex Fr.], and *Stromatoscypha fimbriata* (Pers. ex Fr.) Donk [basinym: *Polyporus fimbriatus* (Pers.) ex Fr.].

INTRODUCTION TO THE SERIES.—A few words may be said about the origin of the present series. For about twelve years before World War II hit Java, I was engaged in the preparation of a "Genera of Hymenomycetes." It soon appeared that the application of many generic names was uncertain and rather than using them in a haphazard manner, I tried to find out more about them in order to apply them as correctly as possible. This proved an arduous task. When it was completed, the "Genera" were sent to the printer's. As a consequence of the war, the text that went to the printer's, the already printed sheets, as well as the trunk containing the carbon-copy, nearly all of the notes on which the manuscript was based, and about 500 especially prepared illustrations were destroyed. However, a carbon-copy of the nomenclatural part, abandoned several years before the book was finished, was retrieved. It lacked, of course, all the corrections and additions made between its storing-away and the finishing of the final manuscript. I have not seriously tried to cover once more the entire

* Keeper of Herbarium Bogoriense, Kebun Raya Indonesia.

10 SEP 1956

field from which they were compiled. Starting from the old copy I have tried to round it off as completely as possible during spare moments. Much of this work was done during a visit to England and the United States where I enjoyed all the facilities of the British Museum (Natural History), the Kew Herbarium, and the Farlow Library. Only a very few references cited have not been verified personally. The user will certainly notice many serious omissions; some of them may be excused by reminding him of the hazards of modern times.

I would like to stress one point in particular. This nomenclatural series has not been drawn up without giving attention to the corresponding fungi themselves. I studied the plants first and only dived into nomenclatural matters afterwards. Each group was given serious taxonomical consideration in order to arrive at a first-hand definition of their genera. No nomenclatural studies should be made without a sound knowledge of the corresponding plants. Especially a fair number of generic type specimens were examined during often prolonged visits, more in particular to the Rijksherbarium at Leiden (Herbarium Persoon!), the Universitetets Institution för Systematisk Botanik at Uppsala (Herbarium Fries!), the Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle, Laboratoire de Cryptogamie at Paris, the Herbarium of the Royal Botanic Gardens at Kew, the Farlow Herbarium at Cambridge, Mass. (Herbarium Patouillard!), to the late l'Abbé H. Bourdot at St.-Priest-en-Murat, France, and to many other institutions and mycologists. For a number of years I had the rich library of Bibliotheca Bogoriensis and the fungus collections of Herbarium Bogoriense at my disposal. Several mycologists have supplied me with specimens of critical and historically important species and I am very grateful for their kindness.

One of the principal objects of this study has been to fix a type species where it was necessary to select one. This has been done not only in regard to the original publication, but the historical development of the names and their genera have also been taken into consideration. To serve stability in nomenclature has always been one of the guiding principles when selecting. For a long time no fixed regulations were available and even the recently adopted ones have the force of Recommendations and not of Rules. Therefore, a wide margín has been left to individual opinions and the selections here adopted should be viewed in this light.

Each code for fixing types is likely to induce enumerations of types adopted. The first flood was published in connection with the American code: Banker (Hydnaceae), Earle (Agaricaceae), Murrill (Polyporaceae).

A second flood was published in anticipation of the international regulations promised several years ago but not yet agreed upon when those lists were published: Clements & Shear (all groups of fungi), Singer & A. H. Smith (Agricaceae), W. B. Cooke (Polyporaceae), Imazeki (Polyporaceae), Doty (Clavarioid and Chantharelloid fungi), and Donk (Agaricaceae).

Strictly speaking this second flood was premature. Each author trusted that his personal code was sound and would appear to be pretty well identical with the regulations to come. The idea that long lists of type species would be sanctioned as a whole was an opinion tacitly adopted beforehand by some authors and perhaps induced by certain lists of proposals for phanerogams, such as "Species lectotypicae generum Linnaei."

I have committed myself in some papers in which numerous type species for generic names of Hymenomycetes were selected, but want to emphasize that, after the war, the reasons for their publication before the Stockholm Congress was held, were rather of a special nature. In the first place the selecting of type species was done strictly in relation to proposals for conservation and rejection of generic names, in the second place as a reaction to a published list of proposed lectotypes. One never could tell on what actions a Congress might decide and it was playing safe to place the pros and, more in particular, the cons before the public in time.

The present paper forms the first part of a series planned to give a nomenclatural and annotated enumeration of all generic names proposed for Hymenomycetes. The manuscript of this series now reaches completion, but I hesitate to send it to the printer's as a whole because of the changes recently made in the "International Rules of Botanical Nomenclature" at the Stockholm Congress, some of which are drastic and have still to be studied as to their consequences. Viewpoints adopted until recently will have to be revised and this may give rise to several alterations, and renewed consultation of an extensive amount of literature will be necessary. Therefore, it was decided to postpone the publication of the bulk of the work and to publish it in sections, the smaller ones first.

An attempt has been made to include all generic names effectively published at or after the introduction of the Linnean system of nomenclature, whether of not they were validly published. A distinction is made between, (i) names that are pre-Friesian, that is, published before the starting-point date of Hymenomycetes (lichens excepted), 1821, and have never been taken up after that date, (ii) names published after the

starting-point date but not validly published, and (iii) names validly published after the starting-point date. The former two categories are more casually dealt with (names spaced) than the third (names in bold-faced type). Names treated between square brackets are considered to belong to other than Hymenomycetous fungi, although they are or were included in that group. An alphabetical sequence will be followed in each paper.

The registration of names in this series, even when they are considered validly published or priorable, does not denote the author's intention to assign to them any other status under the Rules than the one they actually possess. New names or new recombinations will be unambiguously indicated.

A few terms require an explanation.

Devalidated names. These were published between the starting-point date and 1753 and would have been validly published if the starting-point date of the groups to which they belong had not been changed from 1753 to a later one. I am well aware that even these names are sometimes considered validly published though 'illegitimate.' This view may be interpreted as indicating that they count in matters of homonymy exactly as names validly published after their starting-point date. This view is not generally accepted and as a rule devalidated names are left out of consideration in homonymy questions. One point is certain: devalidated names are at least 'illegitimate' (= impriorable).

Priorable and *impriorable names.* A priorable name is a name validly published after the starting-point date and counting in priority considerations; it may become a correct name if it be the earliest given to a group in a certain circumscription and rank and including its type. Validly published names may be impriorable for various reasons; they may be later homonyms, nomina confusa, and so on. It would seem that the equivalents in the Rules as altered at the Stockholm Congress might be 'legitimate' and 'illegitimate' names, but it is certain that 'legitimate' is still too loosely applied, even misunderstood, and is confusingly defined; and that its antonym 'illegitimate' has as yet no strict meaning at all. Therefore, Furtado's terms 'priorable' and 'impriorable' are to be preferred in anticipation of improvements in the definitions of the other set of terms. A name may be of a restricted priorability: a nomen anamorphosis is impriorable in regard to the corresponding perfect state, but if applied only to imperfect fungi it may well be priorable.

Nomen anamorphosis. The name is based on an imperfect state,

Protonym. Neither a devalidated nor a validly published though effectively published name, but taken up and validly published afterwards.

Typonym. A name having the same type as another name which is neither its basinym nor a synisonym. As long as the Rules say that a generic name has a species as its type, names having the same type species might be called typonyms. However, the ultimate type, the material basis of a generic name, comparable to the type of a species, may well be different in such a set of typonyms and I would prefer to define a 'typonym' as a name having the same ultimate type as another name not having the basinym-isonym relation. This narrow and preferable meaning is not adopted in the present series.

Synisonyms. Names having the same basinym.

Monadelphous homonyms. A devalidated generic name may have been validly re-published (after the starting-point date) independently by two or more authors, often in such a manner that different groups with different type species (by selection or 'original designation') are involved. These species may be original ones of the devalidated name, or species included afterwards, but prior to the starting-point date. Of such a resulting set of monadelphous homonyms, severed from their common source by Art. 20, the later members are here treated as mere applications (often 'misapplications') of the earliest one.

Typonymous homonyms. Typonyms that are at the same time homonyms. In these cases, too, the later name is here treated as an application of the earlier one.

DEFINITION OF "CYPHELLACEAE." — The "Cyphellaceae" are now often accepted as a special family of Hymenomycetes. However, the circumscription has not yet become stabilized and the contents are still steadily increasing. The family name is here placed between inverted commas for several reasons to be stated in detail in a forthcoming taxonomical paper; one of the reasons is the fact that the group is extremely heterogeneous and unnatural.

The limits set to the "family" are the more generally adopted ones of to-day, i.e. included are such Hymenomycetes-Homobasidiae as have their smooth (or somewhat wrinkled) hymenium lining the hollowed-out (or flat), downward looking side of the fruit-body, the attachment of the latter to the substratum being at the opposite, sterile side (and never exactly marginal). The "disc" is never compounded by partitions sterile on edge, although more or less pronounced gill-like folds may occur.

Numerous fruit-bodies may be crowded on a resupinate stroma; in such cases the whole may form a fruit-body of higher order.

Excluded are the following genera which have been entered, or suggested for entrance, into the "family":

Arrhenia Fr. ("Thelephoraceae"),

Campanella P. Henn. ("Agaricaceae"),

Caripia O.K. (*Podostrombium* Kunze, *Hypolyssus* "Berk.," etc.) ("Clavariaceae"),

Dacryobolus Fr. ("Hydnaceae"),

Discocyphella P. Henn. ("Thelephoraceae"),

Favolaschia (Pat.) Pat. (including *Porolaschia* Pat.) ("Polyporaceae"),

Fistulina Bull. ex Fr. ("Polyporaceae"),

Pistillina Quél. ("Clavariaceae"),

Punctularia Pat. ("Thelephoraceae"),

Stereophyllum P. Karst. ("Thelephoraceae"), and

Trogia Fr. ("Agaricaceae").

On the other hand one will encounter below some names not definitely associated with this "family" before, viz. *Merismodes* (the type of which is an avowed species of "*Cyphella*"), *Pleurotopsis*, and *Plicatura*. Their 'gills,' if any, are not at all comparable to those of the true agarics and represent mere folds of the hymenial layer like the folds in *Merulius*. Their fruit-bodies are 'Cyphelloid' at least in origin. *Peniophorina* and *Wiesnerina*, with pinhead-shaped fruit-bodies, agree more closely with the definition of the present group than with the "Thelephoraceae" and are, therefore, listed in this paper.

The number of genera could have been increased easily if the definition above were strictly adhered to, for instance with *Stereum* Pers. ex S. F. Gray, *Sterellum* P. Karst., *Merulius* Fr., and the like, but not counting a few exceptions (*Rimbachia:* cups upturned), I have kept to the traditional delimitation.

It will also be noticed that *Leptoglossum* (and its synonyms) are incorporated in the present paper, although it does not answer to the adopted definition of this "family" (lateral stipe). This has been done in view of the very closely related genus *Leptotus*.

APHABETICAL ENUMERATION

Aleurocystus "McGinty": Lloyd, Mycol. Writ. 6: 1088. 1921 (not validly published); see also: Stevenson & Cash *in* Bull. Lloyd Libr. No. 35: 42. 1936. — A 'McGinty' name, not accepted by the author who

published it, and to be valued as a provisional name. It was introduced under *Aleurodiscus capensis* Lloyd as follows:—

"It is the only *Aleurodiscus* known with subgelatinous texture and cystidia except *Aleurodiscus corneus* which is probably the same. A 'new genus' (*Aleurocystus* McGinty) could be based on its texture and presence of cystidia."—Lloyd (*l.c.*).

G. W. Martin (*in* Lloydia 5: 161. 1942) considered the two species mentioned by Lloyd, as well as *Corticium hakgallae* ("*habgallae*") Berk. & Br., as conspecific; the chlamydosporic state of *C. hakgallae* is *Matula poroniaeformis* (Berk. & Br.) Mass., the type species of *Matula* Mass. (1888; nomen anamorphosis). Martin also identified *Matula rompelii* (J. Rick) Lloyd with *M. poroniaeformis*. I can not yet follow Martin in all these conclusions (which were not all of them reached by an actual study of specimens). W. B. Cooke (*in* Mycologia 43: 208. 1951) follows Martin.

GENERAL REMARK ON THE MCGINTY NAMES. — C. G. Lloyd coined and published several names in a jocular spirit. Thus, in his "Mycological Writings," a fictitious Prof. McGinty acted as the author of a number of new names, of which, in the present paper, *Aleurocystus* is a good example. Lloyd's intention was to ridicule and imitate certain mycologists he labelled as 'name jugglers,' 'splitters,' and 'new species hunters,' One point emerges incontestably: the McGinty names were not acceptable to Lloyd himself, the publishing author. However, he repeatedly admonished future authors not to forget the existence of the McGinty names, which he apparently considered validly published. This is clear: these names belong to the class of nomina provisoria! Not being accepted by the publishing author, they were "merely proposed in anticipation of the future acceptance of the group concerned, or of a particular circumscription, position, or rank of the group," and hence were not validly published. Many of the McGinty names were often purposely and somewhat maliciously coined after bad examples, and served as punishment in store for those who dared to deviate from the usually rather crude taxonomical views to which Lloyd adhered. A number of the names in question were published as nomina nuda. Some were taken up by subsequent authors and validly published on such an occasion.

Stevenson & Cash, in their valuable "The new fungus names proposed by C. G. Lloyd" (*in* Bull. Lloyd Libr. No. 35. 1936) brought together all of that author's new names, inclusive of McGinty's. Several of these names were originally accompanied by insufficient descriptions or were perfect examples of nomina nuda. To such names the two compilers added Lloyd's own herbarium-notes when available and when not previously published; these notes often amount to descriptions. They were offered purely as a matter of record and Stevenson & Cash (p. 2) were careful in pointing out that in their book: "No attempt has been made to evaluate or to discuss critically the species [and genera] here listed. For instance, we have included most of the names published by Lloyd under the 'nom-the-plume' N. J. McGinty as a matter of record since upon critical study a few of these at least may be found [taxonomically] valid." Therefore, in their compilation one will find the McGinty names effectively re-published and some of them with an accompanying description, but it is evident that in the light of Art. 37 bis, the "publishing authors," in this case Stevenson &

Cash, did not ensure their valid publication. They had no intention to do so ("incidental mention")!

Aleurodiscus Rab. *ex* J. Schroet. *in* Cohn, Krypt.-Fl. Schles. 3 (1): 429. 1888. — ETYMOLOGY: *ἄλευρον*, flour; *δίσκος*, round plate. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Peziza amorpha* Pers. = *Thelephora amorpha* Pers. ex Fr. = *Aleurodiscus amorphus* (Pers. ex Fr.) J. Schroet.[1] — PROTONYM: *Aleurodiscus* Rab., Fung. europ. exs. No. 1824. 1874; *in* Hedwigia 13: 184. 1874.—This name was published as a nomen nudum: no description. It should be noted that the distributed specimens are accompanied by a printed label showing drawings of microscopical hymenium-elements of the only species attributed to the genus by Rabenhorst, *Peziza amorpha*. However, as the species was not a new one, the name *Aleurodiscus* was not validly published even by the provision of a "plate with analyses showing essential characters." — VALID PUBLICATION. The following is quoted from Cooke:—

"On *Corticium amorphum*. Fries. . . . In 1872, Mr. C. H. Peck described in the 24th Report of the State Museum of New York (p. 96), a new genus under the name of *Nodularia*, for the reception of a fungus found by him on the bark of *Abies balsamea*. . . . [Having] been favoured by Mr. Peck with specimens, it became at once evident that he had met with the *Peziza amorpha* of Persoon, of which his *Nodularia balsamicola* is a synonym. . . . [This] fungus cannot well be referred to any constituted genus, except such as have been constructed to receive it as the type. These, apparently, are two—the *Nodularia*, of Peck (1872), and *Aleurodiscus*, of Rabenhorst (1874). The claim of priority on the part of Peck is, however, set aside by the fact of *Nodularia* being appropriated by Karsten, in his 'Monographia Pezizarum Fennicarum,' p. 104 (in 1869), for a Pezizoid fungus . . . . Although he only uses it with the value of a subgenus, it is a prior name. . . . *Aleurodiscus* appears to have the best claim for acceptance. . . ."—Cooke (*in* Grevillea 3: 136-137. 1875).

Donk (*in* Bull. bot. Gdns Buitenzorg III 17: 156, 159-160. 1941) at first thought that Cooke, who definitely accepted the name *Aleurodiscus* and definitely identified it with *Nodularia* Peck, validly published the name *Aleurodiscus* by a reference to Peck's generic name, and that consequently *Aleurodiscus* Rab. ex Cooke had to be considered an isonym of *Nodularia* Peck, and accordingly based on *N. balsamicola* rather than on the distributed specimens of Rabenhorst. This opinion was subscribed to by D. P. Rogers & Jackson (*in* Farlowia 1: 269. 1943). I can no longer maintain this view (see Donk *in* Bull. bot. Gdns Buitenzorg III 18: 88. 1949). The only reference that could have ensured valid publication for *Aleurodiscus* as used by Cooke, is the one to *Aleurodiscus* Rab., the avowed and,

[1] This recombination is ascribed to J. Schroeter rather than to Rabenhorst (or Cooke).

of course, only basinym, the valid publication of which was not questioned by Cooke, and, because that reference is to an invalidly published name without a description, it is worthless.[1] The 'reference' to *Nodularia* Peck is a mere quotation of an other name in synonymy under *Aleurodiscus* Rab., and should evidently not be acceptable as a valid reference! Nothing can be detected in Cooke's account that could be valued as a valid (generic) description: the taxonomical (and partly quite erroneous) remarks all apply to *Peziza amorpha* as a species, and not to *Aleurodiscus* as a genus. It is useless to interpret this descriptive matter as a descriptio generico-specifica, since Rabenhorst's and Cooke's monotypic genus was not based on a new species. Compare also Cooke *in* Grevillea 3: 172. 1875. — Thus I return to the established view that the first to publish validly the name *Aleurodiscus* was Schroeter. This author was well aware of the status of Rabenhorst's name, for he added after the name "(Ohne Diagnose)." He supplied a generic diagnosis. — SCOPE. Schroeter included, besides *Peziza amorpha,* a second species. — TYPIFICATION. The species for which the name was introduced, and which was first especially indicated as the type by Burt (*in* Ann. Missouri bot. Gdn 5: 177. 1918) has been accepted by subsequent authors. — NOMEN CONSERVANDUM. The type species of *Cyphella* Fr. (1822), *q.v.,* is unique among the original members of that genus, and belongs, in my opinion, in the same genus as *Aleurodiscus amorphus,* even if we restrict the latter genus to species with enormous basidia and voluminous spores. Thus it would become necessary to accept the name *Cyphella* for what is now called *Aleurodiscus.* This would require new combinations for all members of the latter genus, except *Cyphella digitalis* (A. & S.) ex Fr. and perhaps one or two other species. The remainder of the species of *Cyphella* are to be located under one or more other generic names, if one regards *C. digitalis* as generically different from them, whether or not one retains the name *Aleurodiscus* or substitutes it by *Cyphella.* So this point can be no hindrance in conserving *Aleurodiscus.* This was proposed by Donk (*l.c.,* 1941). With the latter name conserved, *Cyphella* remains free to be applied to all not yet properly classifiable species already described under that generic name, although it should be kept in mind that such a use is legally improper and only of a temporary character. For a considerable number of species of *Aleurodiscus* the name *'Cyphella'* would be a misnomer. The proposal was supported by D. P. Rogers (*in* Farlowia 3: 433. 1949; 4: 15. 1950), and was provisionally adopted at the Stock-

[1] Cooke, as we have seen, rejected *Nodularia* Peck as being preoccupied and continued: "*Aleurodiscus* appears to have the best claim for acceptance, since the original name of Persoon [*Peziza*] cannot well be retained."

holm Congress (compare Stevenson & D. P. Rogers *in* Plant Disease Rep. 34: 332. 1950).

Auriculariopsis Maire, Rech. cytol. Basid. 102. 1902 (& *in* Bull. Soc. mycol. France 18: Suppl.) — ETYMOLOGY: the genus *Auricularia; ὄψις*, appearance. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species): *Cyphella ampla* Lév. = *Cytidia flocculenta* (Fr.) Höhn. & L.

Calyptella Quél., Ench. Fung. 216. 1886. — ETYMOLOGY: *καλυπτός*, hidden. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Cyphella capula* (Holmsk. ex Fr.) Fr. — SCOPE. Introduced with 18 species taken from *Cyphella* Fr. — TYPIFICATION. The first species, *Cyphella infundibuliformis* Fr. (which Quélet identified inaccurately with *Cyphella abieticola* P. Karst.), is an agaric with reduced gills; the name is an isonym of *Helotium gibbum* A. & S., the type species (selected) of *Perona* Pers. (1825; see Donk *in* Bull. bot. Gdns Buitenzorg III 18: 137. 1949). It might be placed in *Omphalina* Quél. *sensu latissimo* or in *Mycena* (Pers.) ex S. F. Gray *sensu latissimo*. It was unknown to Quélet by personal observation; he did not include it in his "Flore mycologique de France" (1888). The second species is *Cyphella lacera* (Pers.) ex Fr., a highly doubtful, very imperfectly known species. Both may well be excluded as less eligible. With the third species, *Cyphella capula*, as the type, *Calyptella* will be a convenient name for rather a large group of the genus *Cyphella*, the name of which was proposed and provisionally accepted as a nomen rejiciendum in view of *Aleurodiscus* Rab. ex J. Schroet., *q.v.* I am not aware of a previous selection. *Cyphella capula* is a common fungus in Europe and rather well known.

Catilla Pat. *in* Bull. Soc. mycol. France 31: 32. 1925. — ETYMOLOGY: catillus, small platter. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species): *Cyphella pandani* Pat.

[*Chaetocypha* Corda *in* Sturm, Deutschl. Fl., Pilze 2: 132. 1829. — Type species (only original species): *Chaetocypha variabilis* Corda. This species is imperfectly known. In his later work Corda himself (Ic. Fung. 5: 44. 1842; "*Chaetocphye*") buried it, with other generic names, under the caption: "Holt einen grossen Sarg"! Personally I do not consider it a basidiomycete. Fries (Epicr. 569. 1838) placed it as a synonym under *Cyphella goldbachii* Weinm.; it does not agree with any of the current interpretations of that fungus. — Accepting Fries' identification and rejecting *Cyphella* Fr. as a later homonym on account of *Cyphelium* Ach. (1814), O. Kuntze (Rev. Gen. Pl. 2: 847. 1891) substituted

Chaetocypha for *Cyphella*. — Variant spelling: "*Chaetocyphe*": Corda, Ic. Fung. 5: 44. 1842 ("*Chaetocphye*"); Ainsworth & Bisby, Dict. Fungi 53. 1943; 2d Ed., 58. 1945. — Homonym. *Chaetoscypha* Syd. (1924; Helotiales, Ascomycetes) should presumably be considered a later homonym, although the spelling is not exactly the same.]

[*Chaetocyphe*.—See *Chaetocypha*.]

[*Chlorocyphella* Speg. *in* Anal. Mus. nac. Buenos Aires 19 (= III 12): 219. 1909. — Type species (only original species): *Chlorocyphella subtropica* Speg. This is not a basidomycete, but an imperfect fungus which has been interpreted as a lichen or as a fungus parasitic on lichens; compare Keissler (*in* Ann. naturh. Mus. Wien 41: 157-161. 1927) and E. Mameli-Calvino (*in* Nuovo Giorn. bot Ital. 37: 369-370. 1930).]

Chromocyphella De-Toni & Levi *in* The Naturalist 1888: 158. — ETYMOLOGY: χρῶμα, colour; the genus *Cyphella*. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species of basinym): *Cymbella crouani* Pat. & Doass. apud Pat. — BASINYM: *Cymbella* Pat. (1886), *q.v.* — VALID PUBLICATION. By means of a reference. — REMARK. A name change, the basinym being preoccupied. — SYNISONYMS: *Phaeocarpus* Pat. (1887; preoccupied) and *Phaeocyphella* Pat. (1900; superfluous).

Corniola S. F. Gray, Nat. Arrang. Brit. Pl. 1: 637. 1821. — ETYMOLOGY: from an Italian name mentioned by Micheli (Nov. Pl. Gen. 151. 1729) for a species of *Fungus* which has nothing to do with Gray's genus. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Merulius muscigenus* (Bull.) Pers. = *Cantharellus muscigenus* (Bull.) ex Fr. — SCOPE. Introduced with two British species, *Merulius muscigenus* and *Merulius lobatus* Pers. — TYPIFICATION. The first species is considered the type; it was indicated as such by Earle (*in* Bull. N. York bot. Gdn 5: 384. 1909). It is the better known of the two original species, and in addition the one answering best to the generic diagnosis which contains "Stem lateral." The choice of Singer & A. H. Smith (*in* Mycologia 38: 253. 1946), *Merulius lobatus*, has to be rejected because the words "Thallus stemless" of its description, as given by Gray himself, oppose the generic diagnosis. — HOMONYM: *Corniola* Adans. (1763; Papilionaceae). — STATUS. Impriorable on account of the earlier homonym. — TYPONYMS: *Leptoglossum* P. Karst. (1879) and *Dictyolus* Quél. (1886).

Cymbella Pat. *in* Rev. mycol. No. 29: 27. 1886 — ETYMOLOGY: cymba, boat. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species): *Cymbella crouani* Pat. & Doass. apud Pat.—This is the same as a current interpretation

of *Cyphella galeata* (Schum. ex Fr.) Fr. — HOMONYM: *Cymbella* C. Agardh (1830; Cymbellaceae, Bacillariophyceae). — STATUS. Impriorable on account of the earlier hor..onym; three times renamed. — ISONYMS: *Chromocyphella* De-Toni & Levi (1888), *Phaeocarpus* Pat. (1887; preoccupied), and *Phaeocyphella* Pat. (1900; superfluous).

Cypella.—See *Cyphella*.

Cypharium Clem.—See under *Cyphella*.

Cyphella Fr., Syst. mycol. 2 (1) : 201. 1822. — ETYMOLOGY: κύφελλον, hollow of ear. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (selected) : *Cyphella digitalis* (A. & S.) *ex* Fr., Syst. mycol. 2 (1) : 201. 1822 = **Aleurodiscus digitalis** (A. & S. ex Fr.) Donk, *comb. nov.* — SCOPE. Introduced with five species, the first being *C. digitalis*. — TYPIFICATION. *C. digitalis* is considered the type species for various reasons. It agrees best with the original generic diagnosis; it was Fries' leading species; and it was already repeatedly selected before: Corda (Ic. Fung. 5: 37. 1842; Anleit. Stud. Mykol. 154. 1842; "Wir betrachten *C. Digitalis* als Normart."), Burt (*in* Ann. Missouri bot. Gdn 1: 358. 1914), Clements & Shear (Gen. of Fungi 344. 1931), Donk (*in* Bull. bot. Gdns Buitenzorg III 17: 259. 1941), and D. P. Rogers (*in* Farlowia 3: 433. 1949). No rival selections. — HOMONYM. *Cyphelium* Ach. (1814) should not be considered a homonym as was done by O. Kuntze (see under *Chaetocypha*). — VARIANT SPELLING: "*Cypella*": Steudel, Nomencl. Pl. crypt. 142. 1824.—Evidently an unintentional error. — ISONYM: *Cypharium* Clem., Univ. Stud. Nebraska 3 (1) : 72. 1902.—A grammatical 'correction.' Not validly published: no reference, no description. Introduced as follows: "*Cyphella* = *Cypharium*." — NOMEN REJICIENDUM. See under *Aleurodiscus*.

Cyphellopsis Donk *in* Meded. Nederl. mycol. Ver. 18-20: 128. 1931. — ETYMOLOGY: the genus *Cyphella*; ὄψις, appearance. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (selected) : *Solenia anomala* (Pers. ex Fr.) Fuck. — SCOPE. Introduced with three species. — TYPIFICATION. The first species is regarded as the type by the author of the name, who forgot to mention this fact by an oversight.

Cytidia Quél., Fl. mycol. France 25. 1888. — ETYMOLOGY: κύτος, hollow vessel. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species) : "*Cytidia rutilans* Pers. litt. ad Mougeot."—This species, which Quélet himself (as described by him) identified with *Corticium salicinum* (Fr.) Fr., is certainly the latter species, although the spore was given as "sphérique

(0^{mm}008)"; compare also Burt (*in* Ann. Missouri bot. Gdn 11: 11. 1924). — REMARK. Clements & Shear (Gen. of Fungi 344. 1931) suggested as the type a species transferred to the genus long after its foundation: *Cytidia flocculenta* (Fr.) Höhn. & L. — TYPONYMS. *Lomatia* (Fr.) P. Karst. (1889; preoccupied) and *Lomatina* P. Karst. (1892).

Dendrocyphella Petch *in* Ann. bot. Gdns Peradeniya 7: 289. 1922. — Etymology: *δένδρον*, tree; the genus *Cyphella*. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species): *Dendrocyphella setosa* Petch.

Dictyolus Quél., Ench. Fung. 139. 1886. — ETYMOLOGY: *δίκτυον*, net. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Cantharellus muscigenus* (Bull.) ex Fr. — SCOPE. Corresponds to *Cantharellus* trib. *Pleuropus* Fr. [Syst. mycol. 1: 317, 322. 1821 (nomen); Hym. europ. 460. 1874], although this was not expressly stated. Quélet listed eight species and one with doubt; the first species is *Cantharellus spathulatus* Fr., rather an imperfectly known fungus; the second is *C. muscigenus*. — TYPIFICATION. *Cantharellus muscigenus* was considered the type species by Earle (*in* Bull. N. York bot. Gdn 5: 406. 1909), Murrill (*in* N. Amer. Fl. 9: 165. 1910), Singer & A. H. Smith (*in* Mycologia 38: 270. 1946), and Doty (*in* Lloydia 11: 130. 1948). The suggestion by Clements & Shear (Gen. of Fungi 348. 1931) of choosing *Cantharellus lobatus* (Pers.) ex Fr. has no advantages over the earlier indication and should be disregarded. — REMARK. "*Dictyolus* Pat." of Ulbrich (*in* Lindau Krypt.-Fl. Anf., 3. Aufl., 1: 141. 1928), covering *Cantharellus umbonatus* Pers. ex Fr., is a misapplication. — VARIANT SPELLINGS: "*Dyctiolus*": Pat., Hym. d'Eur. 129. 1887. — "*Dyctiotus*": Fayod *in* Ann. Sci. nat., Bot. VII 9: 304. 1889. — NOMEN CONSERVANDUM (proposed). *Dictyolus* was proposed as a nomen conservandum against *Leptoglossum* P. Karst., *q.v.*, by Maire (*apud* Int. Rules bot. Nomencl., 3. Ausg., 123. 1935). Donk (*in* Bull. bot. Gdns Buitenzorg III 17: 185. 1941; 18: 152. 1949), Singer & A. H. Smith (*in* Mycologia 38: 291. 1946), and D. P. Rogers (*in* Farlowia 3: 442. 1949) did not support this proposal. — TYPONYMS: *Corniola* S. F. Gray (1821; preoccupied) and *Leptoglossum* P. Karst. (1879).

Dyctiolus.—See *Dictyolus.*

Dyctiotus.—See *Dictyolus.*

"*E p i b r y u s.*"—*Thelephora* subgen. *Epibryus* Pers., Myc. europ. 1: 115. 1822. — This infrageneric epithet is here listed because it might be considered as published as a generic nomen alternativum. Persoon (*l.c.*) added after the subgeneric description: "Fungilli hujus generis (?) . . . ."

The term denoting the subgeneric rank of the name will be found mentioned in an observation under *Peziza capula* on page 281. — The group covered two species of which the first is the one best known: *Thelephora vulgaris* Pers. (selected type species). Its variety "*a. candida* Pers." was figured, and described before under the name of *Thelephora muscigena* Pers.

Gloeosoma Bres. *in* Ann. mycol. 18: 51. 1920. — ETYMOLOGY: γλοιός, sticky; σῶμα, body. Gender: n. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species): *Aleurodiscus vitellinus* (Lév.) Pat.

Henningsomyces O. K., Rev. Gen. Pl. 3 (3): 483. 1898. — ETYMOLOGY: P. Ch. Hennings; μύκης, fungus. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Solenia candida* Pers. — BASINYM: "*Solenia* Hoffm. 1795" = *Solenia* Pers., *q.v.* (devalidated name).—It is incorrect to indicate Hoffmann (Deutschl. Fl. 2: *pl. 8.* 1795) as the author of *Solenia.* As Burt (*in* Ann. Missouri bot. Gdn 11: 14. 1924) remarked: "The priority of Persoon's publication of *Solenia* is clearly established by Hoffmann's own work, for on the page of text following plate 8 he gives the full title of Persoon's work and its place of publication." — SCOPE. Because the name *Henningsomyces* was validly published through a reference, the type species should be selected from the genus as understood by Hoffmann, and because he is not the original author, the elements added by Hoffmann to Persoon's genus in its original circumscription become relatively unimportant since Hoffmann did not misapply the name. O. Kuntze took the genus in the delimitation of *Solenia* of Saccardo (Syll. Fung. 6: 424. 1888). — TYPIFICATION. The only original species of the basinym, corrected as to its author, viz. *Solenia candida* Pers., is here taken as the type. — REMARK. *Henningsomyces* was introduced because *Solenia* "Hoffm." was regarded as impriorable on account of *Solenia* "Hill 1751, 1773." — HOMONYM: *Henningsomyces* Sacc. (1905; Dothideales, Ascomycetes).

Lachnella Fr., Fl. scan. 343. 1835. — ETYMOLOGY: λάχνος, sheep's wool. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (by original designation): *Peziza alboviolascens* A. & S. ex Fr. = *Lachnella alboviolascens* (A. & S. ex Fr.) Fr. — REMARKS. The valid publication of this generic name in 1835 has been generally overlooked, as was pointed out by the Tulasnes (Sel. Fung. carp. 3: 173 foot-note. 1865): "*Pezizam albo-violascentem* . . . , *Lachnellarum* Friesianarum olim typum primarium (Fl. Scan. p. 343) . . ."; and more recently by Nannfeldt:—

"In dieser Zusammenhang kann hervorgehoben werden, dass die Angabe v. Höhnels [Myc. Fragm. *in* Ann. mycol. 15: 338. 1917], die Gattung *Lachnella* sei in S. Veg. Scand., p. 365, mit *L. barbata* (Kze.) als Typus aufgestellt, irrig ist. *Lachnella* wurde nämlich bereits in Fl. scan., p. 343, aufgestellt, und *Peziza alboviolascens* A. & S. wird ausdrücklich als deren Typus bezeichnet."—Nannfeldt (*in* Nova Acta Soc. Sci. upsal IV 8 (2): 265. 1932). — Fries stated: "*Lachnellae*, quarum typus *Peziza albo-violascens*, sunt . . . ."

Compare also Fries' earlier remark under *Peziza alboviolascens:* "Species distinctissima, forsan novi generis typus."—[Syst. mycol. 2 (1): 96. 1822]. — Up till the present *Lachnella* has functioned as a genus of Discomytes. Besides Von Höhnel's choice (*Peziza barbata*), *Peziza flammea* A. & S. was suggested as the type species by Clements & Shear (Gen. of Fungi 327. 1931). Seaver (*in* Mycologia 24: 252. 1932) has already stamped Clements & Shear's choice as regrettable because it picked out the only operculate species and its acceptance would mean the suppression of the generic name *Perrotia* Boud., conveniently established for that fungus a considerable time before. There will certainly be considerable support for proposals to retain *Lachnella* for some genus of Discomycetes, but it may be doubted whether it will be agreed upon such an important detail as the type species to be appointed. On the other hand, with the true type species restored, *Lachnella* will come in handy for a genus of 'Cyphellaceae' and I am going to adopt it accordingly. — ISONYM: *Lachnium* Clem. *in* Univ. Stud. Nebraska 3 (1): 73. 1902.—Not validly published: no diagnosis, no reference. Introduced as follows: "*Lachnella* = *Lachnium.*" Not *Lachnium* Retz. ex P. Karst (1871; Hyaloscyphaceae, Ascomycetes).

Lachnium Clem.—See under *Lachnella.*

Leptoglossum P. Karst. *in* Bidr. Känn. Finl. Nat. Folk 32: xvii, 242. 1879. — ETYMOLOGY: λεπτός, thin: γλῶσσα, tongue. Gender: n. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Cantharellus muscigenus* (Bull.) ex Fr. — SCOPE. Introduced for *Cantharellus* trib. *Pleuropus* Fr. [Syst. mycol. 1: 317, 322. 1821 (nomen); Hym. europ. 460. 1874]. This name was not especially mentioned. P. A. Karsten treated two species, *Cantharellus muscigenus* (first species) and *Cantharellus glaucus* (Batsch) ex Fr. (not an original species of Fries' tribus). — TYPIFICATION. Karsten's first species, perhaps the best known one of the original species, was already selected by Singer & A. H. Smith (*in* Mycologia 38: 270. 1946). — HOMONYM: *Leptoglossum* (Cooke) Sacc. (1884; Geoglossaceae, Ascomycetes), *q.v.*—This name is often incorrectly dated from 1879, the year it was published as a subgeneric epithet: compare Donk (*in* Bull. bot. Gdns Buitenzorg III 17:

185. 1941; 18: 152. 1949). *Leptoglossis* Benth. (1844; *Solanaceae*) is not to be taken as a homonym. — STATUS. Priorable; not to be rejected as a later homonym as has occasionally been done. — NOMEN REJICIENDUM (proposed). See under *Dictyolus* Quél. — TYPONYMS: *Corniola* S. F. Gray (1821; preoccupied) and *Dictyolus* Quél. (1886).

"*Leptopus* Karst."—See *Leptotus*.

Leptotus P. Karst. *in* Bidr. Känn. Finl. Nat. Folk 32: xvii, 242. 1879. — ETYMOLOGY: λεπτός, thin and οὖς, ear, or rather: λεπτότης, thinness. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Cantharellus retirugus* (Bull.) ex Fr. — SCOPE. Introduced for *Cantharellus* trib. *Resupinati* Fr. (Fries, Hym. europ. 460. 1874) and a few species of *Arrhenia* Fr. When publishing the name, P. A. Karsten dealt with four species and a fifth, indicated as belonging doubtfully in the genus. First species: *Cantharellus tenellus* Fr. — TYPIFICATION. *Cantharellus retirugus* was selected by Donk (*in* Bull. bot. Gdns Buitenzorg III 17: 185. 1941) and by Singer & A. H. Smith (*in* Mycologia 38: 270. 1946); this species and *C. lobatus* (Pers.) ex Fr. were the two known to Karsten from personal observation. Earle (*in* Bull. N. York bot. Gdn 5: 389. 1909; under "*Leptopus*") considered *C. tenellus* as the type, a decidedly less eligible species (known to Karsten from the literature only) and defensible only when the first-species rule is to be applied rigidly. — REMARK. *Leptoglossum* P. Karst. and *Leptotus* were simultaneously published and the two groups are sometimes combined into one genus. As far as I am aware, Ricken (Blätterp. 5. 1910: "Die Abtrennung der umgewendeten Arten als Gattung *Leptotus* halte ich für belastend.") was the first to place definitely one of the names in the synonymy of the other, retaining the name *Leptoglossum*, which thus becomes the correct one for the combination of the two genera. Maire (*in* Treb. Mus. Ci. nat. Barcelona 15: Sèr. bot. No. 2: 52. 1933) preferred *Leptotus* for the combination. — VARIANT SPELLING: "*Leptopus*": Earle *in* Bull. N. York bot. Gdn 5: 389. 1909. — HOMONYMS: *Leptotes* Lindl. (1833; Orchidaceae) and *Leptotis* Hoffmansegg (1824; Compositae) should perhaps be considered orthograpically different homonyms, the difference in spelling being too slight, and rather 'internal,' the termination (final letter) being the same in all cases. — STATUS. If considered a later homonym, *Leptotus* P. Karst. would be impriorable.

Lomatia (Fr.) P. Karst. *in* Bidr. Känn. Finl. Nat. Folk 48: 403. 1889 (German translation of Swedish diagnosis *in* Bot. Cbl. 43: 384. 1890). — ETYMOLOGY: λῶμα, border. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (only species

included): *Corticium salicinum* (Fr.) Fr. — BASINYM: *Corticium* sect. (?). *Lomatia* Fr., Hym. europ. 646. 1874 [= *Corticium* trib. *Apus* Fr., Epicr. 557. 1838 = *Thelephora* trib. *Apus* subtrib. *Auricularia* sect. *Cartilagineae* Fr., Elench. 1: 169. 1828 = *Thelephora* trib. *Resupinatus* sect. *R. spurii* Fr., Syst. mycol. 1: 441. 1821].—Fries (1874) included nine species of which one with doubt ("*C. ? amorphum*"). — SCOPE. Although this name is an avowed isonym of *Corticium* subdivision *Lomatia* Fr., because P. A. Karsten captioned the genus "*Lomatia* (Fr.)," the group was considerably restricted. Only one species was treated when the genus was founded. — REMARK. I, herewith, select *C. salicinum* as the type species of the Friesian subdivisions mentioned above, inclusive of the basinym of the generic name *Lomaria*, if such a procedure should still be necessary in view of Karsten's restriction of the group. In case this selection should appear untenable, the type of the present generic name and of *Lomatina* P. Karst. should apparently be changed accordingly, in view of a recent alteration in the Rules (Art. 58) that seems to have been accepted at Stockholm. — HOMONYM: *Lomatia* R. Br. (1810; Proteaceae; nomen conservandum). *Lomatium* Raf. (1819; Umbelliferae) should not be considered a homonym. — ISONYM: *Lomatina* P. Karst. (1892), *q.v.* — STATUS. Impriorable on account of the earlier homonym and, therefore, changed into *Lomatina* P. Karst.

Lomatina P. Karst. *in* Hedwigia 31: 220. 1892; Krit. Öfvers. Finl. Basidsv. Till. 2: 29. 1893. — ETYMOLOGY: derived from *Lomatia*. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (same as of basinym): *Corticium salicinum* (Fr.) Fr. — BASINYM: *Lomatia* (Fr.) P. Karst. (1889), *q.v.* — REMARK. A name change, the basinym being preoccupied. — TYPONYM: *Cytidia* Quél. (1888), *q. v.*

Merismodes Earle *in* Bull. N. York bot. Gdn 5: 406. 1909. — ETYMOLOGY: *Merisma; εἶδος*, like. Gender (selected): m. — TYPE SPECIES (by original designation): *Cantharellus fasciculatus* Schw.—Burt (*in* Ann. Missouri bot. Gdn 1: 373. 1914) identified this species with, and cited the type under, *Cyphella fasciculata* Berk. & C., remarking: "I do not understand why Berkeley attempted authorship for [*Cyphella fasciculata*]. The *C. fasciculata* B. & C. is certainly that of Schweinitz both in description and in fascicled form of types." Compare also Lloyd (Mycol. Writ. 7: 1356. 1925). — SCOPE. Introduced for *Cantharellus* sect. *Merisma* Fr. of Saccardo's "Sylloge" (5: 499. 1887).

Nodularia Peck *in* Ann. Rep. N. York State Mus. 24: 96. 1872. — ETYMOLOGY: nodus, node. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (only original

species): *Nodularia balsamicola* Peck. = *Aleurodiscus amorphus* (Pers. ex Fr.) J. Schroet. — REMARK. See also under *Aleurodiscus*. — HOMONYMS: *Nodularia* Link ex Lyngbye (1819; Lemanaceae, Rhodophyceae) and *Nodularia* Mert. apud Jürg. (1822) ex Bornet & Flah. (1888; 'Nostocaceae Heterocysteae,' Cyanophyceae). — STATUS. Impriorable on account of the earlier homonym.

[*Peniophorina* Höhn. *in* S. B. Akad. Wiss. Wien, math.-nat. Kl. 126 I: 285. 1917. — This genus was based on a collection identified by Von Höhnel with *Chaetostroma pedicellatum* Preuss. I saw Von Höhnel's slides in the Farlow Herbarium and would rather not consider it a basidiomycete. — Generally listed as a genus of "Thelephoraceae."]

Phaeocarpus Pat., Hym. d'Eur. 154. 1887. — ETYMOLOGY: φαιός, dusky; καρπός, fruit, Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species of basinym): *Cymbella crouani* Pat. & Doass. apud Pat. — BASINYM: *Cymbella* Pat. (1886), *q.v.* — HOMONYM: *Phaeocarpus* Mart. & Zucc. (1824; Sapindaceae). — REMARK. A name change for *Cymbella* which is preoccupied. — STATUS. Impriorable again on account of the earlier homonym. — SYNISONYMS: *Chromocyphella* De-Toni & Levi (1888), *q.v.*, and *Phaeocyphella* Pat. (1900; superfluous), *q.v.*

Phaeocyphella Pat., Essai taxon. Hym. 57. 1900. — ETYMOLOGY: φαιός, dusky; the genus *Cyphella*. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species of basinym): *Cymbella crouani* Pat. & Doass. apud Pat. — PROTONYM: *Phaeocyphella* Pat. *in* Bull. Soc. mycol. France 9: 135. 1893. —Nomen nudum. — BASINYM: *Cymbella* Pat. (1886), *q.v.* — HOMONYM: *Phaeocyphella* Speg. (1909; "Cyphellaceae"), *q.v.* — STATUS. A superfluous name change for *Phaeocarpus* Pat. which is preoccupied. Coined unaware of the existence of *Chromocyphella* De-Toni & Levi. — SYNISONYMS: *Phaeocarpus* Pat. (1887; preoccupied), *q.v.*, and *Chromocyphella* De-Toni & Levi (1888), *q.v.*

Phaeocyphella Speg. *in* Anal. Mus. nac. Buenos Aires 19 (= III 12): 278. 1909. — ETYMOLOGY: φαιός, dusky; the genus *Cyphella*. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species): *Phaeocyphella sphaerospora* Speg. — HOMONYM: *Phaeocyphella* Pat. (1900; "Cyphellaceae"), *q.v.* — STATUS. Impriorable on account of the earlier homonym.

Phaeosolenia Speg. *in* Anal. Mus. nac. Buenos Aires 8 (= III 1): 53. 1902. — ETYMOLOGY: φαιός, dusky; the genus *Solenia*. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species): *Phaeosolenia platensis* Speg.

Pleurotopsis (P. Henn.) Earle *in* Bull. N. York bot. Gdn 5: 412. 1909. — ETYMOLOGY: the genus *Pleurotus*; ὄψις, appearance. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (selected for the avowed basinym, by original designation for generic name): *Marasmius spodoleucus* Berk. & Br. = *Plicatura spodoleuca* (Berk. & Br.) Sing.—Compare Singer (*in* Lilloa 8: 444. 1942). — BASINYM: *Marasmius* sect. *Pleurotopsis* P. Henn. *in* Engl. & Pr., Nat. PflFam. 1: I**: 226. 1898.—This is Henning's name for *Marasmius* subgen. *Apus* Fr. (Hym. europ. 480. 1874; Sacc., Syll. Fung. 5: 567. 1887); it is factually nothing but a mere name change. Fries' name was introduced for a single species, *Marasmius spodoleucus*; Saccardo added several species from the world literature to *M. spodoleucus* as the first species. Hennings gave a description only of this, his first, species; all other ones, that is, Saccardo's to which again a few more were added, were only very briefly mentioned. *Marasmius spodoleucus* should undoubtedly be taken up as the type species of Henning's name. — SCOPE. Earle identified his genus categorically with the section of Saccardo's.

Plicatura Peck *in* Ann. Rep. N. York State Mus. 24: 75. 1872. — ETYMOLOGY: plicatus, folded. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species): *Plicatura alni* Peck = *Plicatura nivea* (Fr.) P. Karst. according to P. A. Karsten (*in* Bidr. Känn. Finl. Nat. Folk 48: 342. 1889) and Burt (*in* Ann. Missouri bot. Gdn 4: 326. 1917). Distributed as *Trogia alni* Peck (*in* Thüm., Mycoth. univ. No. 804. 1877).

Porotheleum (Fr. ex Fr.) Fr., Syst. Orb. veg. 80. 1825. — ETYMOLOGY: πόρος, pore; θηλή, nipple. Gender: n. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Poria fimbriata* Pers. = *Boletus fimbriatus* (Pers.) Pers. = *Polyporus fimbriatus* (Pers.) ex Fr. — DEVALIDATED NAME: *Porotheleum* Fr., Obs. mycol. 2: 272. 1818.—When Fries used this name for the first time he attributed two species to it, *Poria fimbriata* and *Porotheleum lacerum* Fr. Note the spelling. — BASINYM: *Polyporus* subgen. *Porotheleum* (Fr.) *ex* Fr., Syst. mycol. 1: 6, 506. 1821.—The species included this time are *Poria fimbriata* and *Boletus subtilis* Schrad. — It is of importance to decide whether *Porotheleum* was published by Fries in 1821 as a generic name or as a subgeneric epithet. In the former case *Porotheleum* would stand being the earlier one of a couple of homonyms; in the other case it would be the later one and thus impriorable. Fries preceded the name (among the omissions at the end of the first volume of "Systema") by the number "VI. B.," the 'VI' representing the genus *Polyporus*. In exactly the same manner '*Coprinus*' and '*Gomphus*' were established in the main text of the same volume as undoubtedly subgeneric epithets. The species in-

cluded were indicated as "*P. P. fimbriatum*" and "*P. P. subtile.*" This obviously means '*Polyporus Porotheleum fimbriatum*' and '*Polyporus Porotheleum subtile.*' The termination of the epithets agrees in gender with '*Porotheleum*' rather than with '*Polyporus.*' In the index to the first volume of "Systema" both epithets were listed under *Polyporus*, with correct termination, *Porotheleum* not being entered at all. In the general index (1832) to the whole work, Fries listed them as follows: "[POLYPORUS] [*fimbriatus*] Fr. (Porotheleum fimbriatum) I. 506. El. I. 125" and "[POLYPORUS] *subtilis* Fr. (Porotheleum subtile) I. 506. El. I. 125," which shows that he admitted having made the combinations under *Polyporus*, although at the time of publishing the general index he considered the combinations under *Porotheleum* the correct ones. The conclusion that '*Porotheleum*' was published in the first part of the starting-point book as a subgeneric epithet seems unavoidable. That indeed Fries in 1821 had changed his mind about the rank of the group becomes exceptionally clear when one compares pages 6 of the first volume of "Systema" and of his "Specimen Systematis Mycologici" (1819). The latter publication consists of an advance issue of the first eight (1-8) pages of "Systema"; there one will find '*Porotheleum*' as a generic name placed between, and equivalent to, *Hydnum* and *Stereum*, printed in capitals and consecutively numbered with those genera. On the corresponding page in "Systema," '*Porotheleum*' appears in italics as a subgeneric epithet under *Polyporus*, to which it was transferred, and is not numbered as a genus any longer. In Fries' "Elenchus" (1: 125. 1828) the group appeared again as "VI. B. POROTHELEUM" but in this case it was spoken of as "Genus omnino distinctum." — In 1821 one of the two original species of 1818, *Porotheleum lacerum*, was not mentioned. — SCOPE. When in 1825 the name was definitely accepted by Fries as a generic one, the species are those of 1821 and in the order given. — TYPIFICATION. There is no doubt that *Poria fimbriata* was the leading species to Fries himself. It was already suggested as the type species by Clements & Shear (Gen. of Fungi 347. 1931) for the name as published in 1818. — VARIANT SPELLING: "*Porothelium*": Reichenb., Consp. Reg. veg. 14. 1828 (*n.v.*); Fr., Gen. Hym. 12. 1836, etc.—In later years Fries preferred invariably this slightly modified spelling, the one at present universally used. — HOMONYM: *Porothelium* Eschw. (1824; Trypetheliaceen, Lichenes). — STATUS. Impriorable on account of the earlier homonym. — ISONYM. Because I consider the type species representing a valid genus, and because this genus appears to have no correct name, the following new names are proposed: **Stromatoscypha** Donk, *nom. nov.* [basinym: *Polyporus* subgen. *Porotheleum* (Fr.)

ex Fr., Syst. mycol. 1: 506. 1821] and **Stromatoscypha fimbriata** (Pers. ex Fr.) Donk, *comb. nov.* [basinym: *Polyporus fimbriatus* (Pers.) *ex* Fr., Syst. mycol. 1: 506. 1821].

Porothelium.—See *Porotheleum*.

Pseudodasyscypha Velen., Nov. mycol. 1: 167. 1939. — ETYMOLOGY: ψευδής, false; the genus *Dasyscypha*. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Cyphella hyperici* Velen. — VALID PUBLICATION & SCOPE. In an observation to the species mentioned, Velenovsky wrote that he considered it and the preceding one, *Cyphella granulosa* (Fuck.) Fuck., as forming a distinct genus. Short diagnosis added. — TYPIFICATION. The species under which the genus was founded is here considered the type.

Rimbachia Pat. *in* Bull. Soc. mycol. France 7: 159. 1891. — ETYMOLOGY: A. Rimbach. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES: *Rimbachia paradoxa* Pat. — REMARK. Owing to the upturned cup this genus does not answer to the definition of "Cyphellaceae" as adopted in the present paper.

Solenia Pers. ex Fr., Syst. mycol 2 (1): 200. 1822. — ETYMOLOGY: σωλήν, pipe. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (selected; only original species of devalidated name): *Solenia candida* Pers. — DEVALIDATED NAME: *Solenia* Pers. *in* Neues Mag. Bot. 1: 116. 1794 (= Tent. 36. 1797).—The one original species is *Solenia candida*. — SCOPE. When validly re-publishing the name, Fries included four species, the second of which is *Solenia candida*. — TYPIFICATION. Persoon's original species is to be considered the type. It was already suggested as such by Clements & Shear (Gen. of Fungi 345. 1931) for "*Solenia* Hoffm." — HOMONYM: *Solena* Lour. (1790; Cucurbitaceae), *Solena* Willd. (1797; Rubiaceae), *Solenia* Agardh (1822; Ulvaceae, Chlorophyceae), and *Solenia* J. Hill ex O. K. (1898; Boletaceae). — ISONYM: *Henningsomyces* O. K. (1898), *q.v.* — STATUS: Impriorable on account of the earlier homonyms so that a new name was introduced for it, *Henningsomyces* O. K.

Stigmatolemma Kalchbr. *in* Grevillea 10: 104. 1882. — ETYMOLOGY: στίγμα, -ατος, brand, stigma; λέμμα, bark. Gender: n. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species): *Stigmatolemma incanum* Kalchbr.

[*Tapesia* (Pers. ex Fr.) Fuck. *in* Jahrb. nassau. Ver. Naturk. 23-24: 300. 1869 (Symb. Mycol.). — This genus originally included, besides Ascomycetes, a number of species of *Solenia* Pers. ex Fr. *sensu lato*. Saccardo, and also Nannfeldt (*in* Nova Acta Soc. Sci. upsal. IV 8 (2): 163.

1932) considered *Tapesia fuscus* (Pers.) Fuck. as the type species, one of the Ascomycetes.]

Trabecularia Bonord.—See "Polyporaceae." The type species, *Trabecularia villosa* Bonord., seems a remarkable form of *Merulius tremellosus* (Schrad.) ex Fr.

Urceolus Velen.—See "Agaricaceae."

Wiesnerina Höhn. *apud* Schiffner *in* Denkschr. math.-nat. Kl. Akad. Wiss. Wien 83: 7 (of reprint). 1907. — ETYMOLOGY: J. Wiesner. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species): *Wiesnerina horrida* Höhn. — REMARK. Generally listed as a genus of "Thelephoraceae."

REINWARDTIA
Published by Herbarium Bogoriense, Kebun Raya Indonesia
Volume 2, Part 3, pp. 435-440 (1954)

THE GENERIC NAMES PROPOSED FOR HYMENOMYCETES—II*

Hymenolichenes

M. A. DONK **

SUMMARY

1. This part deals with the generic names proposed for Hymenolichenes, a very limited group of Hymenomycetes.

2. In connection with *Herpothallon* Tobl. attention is drawn to *Hypochnus* Fr. ex Ehrenb. (non Fr. ex Fr.), which seems to be the correct name for the genus.

INTRODUTION.—The small and heterogeneous group of Hymenolichenes contains those lichens of which the fungus component represents, or is supposed to represent, a hymenomycete. Being lichens their starting-point book is Linnaeus's "Species plantarum," published in 1753, in contrast to all other Hymenomycetes, of which the starting-point date is January 1, 1821.

Apart from the hymenomycete associations which are now nomenclaturely treated as lichens, a few other hymenomycetes have been reported to associate with algae, for instance some species of *Septobasidium* Pat. (cf. Marchionatto *in* Rev. Soc. Argentina Ci. nat. 19: 345-347. 1943) and certain Clavariaceae, like *Clavaria fossicola* Corner, *C. mucida* Fr., and *C. vernalis* Schw. (cf. Corner, Monogr. Clav. 233, 442, 394. 1950).

I am very much indebted to Dr. R. Santesson, Uppsala, for many valuable suggestions.

ALPHABETICAL ENUMERATION

Cilicia Fr., Syst. Orb. veg. 301. 1825. — ETYMOLOGY: cilicium, carpet made of hair. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (by original designation) & SCOPE. "Typus generis est *Theleph. textilis* Spreng.!, sed plures habemus species e tropicis, ubi vulgares videntur . . .." The cited specific name seems not to have been validly published, the original genus not being monotypic. Later on Fries (*in* K. Vet.-Akad. Handl., Stockh. 1848: 144) published the combination *Cora textilis* (Spreng.) Fr., but

* The first Part of this series appeared *in* Reinwardtia 1: 199-220. 1951.
** Keeper of Herbarium Bogoriense, Kebun Raya Indonesia.

10 SEP 1956

again did not furnish a specific description. When Saccardo (Syll. Fung 6: 687. 1888) listed the species, as "*Cora textilis* (Spreng.) Fr. Fung. Nat. p. 24 (nomen), *Theleph.* Spreng. in herb.," he added the original generic description of *Cilicia* (emphatically stating this) and remarked "Nullibi descriptionem inveni hujus speciei, cujus forte ill. Fries specimina habuit a Sprengelio." No specimens could be found at Uppsala. It may be tentatively accepted that it represents a species of *Cora:* "*Cora textilis* Sacc." (with a point of interrogation) and "*Thelephora textilis* Sprgl. apud Sacc." (without such a point) were listed as synonyms of *Cora pavonia* (Sw.) Fr. by Zahlbruckner (Cat. Lich. univ. 7: 744. 1931). — REMARK. *Cilicia* Fr. has been cited with doubt as a synonym of the ascolichenous genus *Chrysothrix* Mont. (1852) by Zahlbruckner (*in* Engl. & Pr., Nat. PflFam., 2. Aufl., 8: 135. 1926) and it will also be found listed with a point of interrogation as a nomen rejiciendum when Zahlbruckner (*in* Int. Rules bot. Nomencl., 3. Ausg., 128. 1935) proposed *Chrysothrix* as a nomen conservandum. This apparently incorrect association can be explained as follows. When Montagne (*in* Ann. Sci. nat., Bot. II 2: 375. 1834) described *Cilicia noli-tangere* Mont., he first assigned it to *Cilicia* Fr. Later on he changed his opinion and placed his species in a genus of its own adding this observation:

"OBS. J'ai dû séparer ce genre du *Cilicia* auquel je l'avais d'abord réuni, en modifiant légèrement sa définition. Car M. Fries persistant (V. *Summ. Veget. Scandin.*, p. 333) à prendre pour type de ce dernier, réuni au genre *Cora*, le *Thelephora sericea* Swartz, dont la fructification, trouvée par mon ami le Rév. M.-J. Berkeley, est exospore ou basidiophore, il n'y a plus moyen de rapprocher dans le même genre deux modes de fructification si divers."—Montagne (*in* Ann. Sci. nat., Bot. III 18: 312-313. 1852).

Thus the association of *Cilicia* with *Chrysothrix* by Zahlbruckner rests on a misapplication of the former name by Montagne. — However, it should be noticed that Fries, on the place cited by Montagne, did not at all insist on *Thelephora sericea* Sw. as the type species of *Cilicia.* He indeed relegated that genus to *Cora* Fr., *q.v.*, as a synonym, but did not mention a type. See the index (p. 566) to "Summa Vegetabilium Scandinaviae," where one will find: "*Cilicia* (sub Cora)." And compare Fries (*in* K. Vet.-Akad. Handl., Stockh. 1848: 143-144): "CORA Fr. *l. c.* [= Epicr.] *p. 556.* Hujus subgenus est CILICIA S. O. V., cujus mihi cognitae species sunt: 1. *Cora sericea* (Swartz!) et 2. *Cora textilis* Spreng.! (Utraque sub Thelephora.) . . . " A few years later Fries (*in* Nova Acta Soc. Sci. upsal. III 1: 113. 1851) was still of the opinion that *Cora* should be divided into two groups, viz., '*Eucora*' and '*Cilicia.*' — TYPONYMS. Compare *Cora*

Fr. (1825), *Gyrolophium* G. Kunze ex Krombh. (1831), and *Wainiocora* Tomaselli (1950). — STARTING-POINT DATE: 1753.

[*Chromocyphella* Speg.—See "Cyphellaceae."]

Cora Fr., Syst. Orb. veg. 300. 1825. — ETYMOLOGY: *Κόρη*, Proserpine, the virgin goddess. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species): *Ulva pavonia* Sw. = *Cora montana* (Sw.) Santesson. — TYPONYMS: *Gyrolophium* G. Kunze ex Krombh. (1831) and compare *Cilicia* Fr. (1825) and *Wainiocora* Tomaselli (1950). — STARTING-POINT DATE: 1753.

Corella Wainio *in* Acta Soc. Fauna Fl. fenn. 7: 243. 1890. — ETYMOLOGY: diminutive of *Cora*. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species): *Corella brasiliensis* Wainio. — STARTING-POINT DATE: 1753.

Dichonema Blume & Th. Nees in Nova Acta Acad. Leop.-Carol. 13: 11. 1826 ("*Dichonemia*"). — ETYMOLOGY: *δίχα*, different, *νῆμα*, spinning, thread. Gender: n. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species): *Dichonema aeruginosa* Blume & Th. Nees.[1]—This was referred as a variety to *Dictyonema sericeum* (Fr.) Mont. by Wainio (*in* J. of Bot., Lond. 34: 297. 1896). — PROTONYM: "*Dichonema* Fr. Nees in litt.": Fr., Syst. Orb. veg. 303. 1825.—When Fries published this name in advance of Blume & Th. F. L. Nees von Esenbeck, he appended this and some other genera and species with doubt to his tribus Coenogoneae ("Appendicis loco subjungam insigniores, quoad fructificationem vero dubias: . . . ") remarking of *Dichonema* in particular, "Forsan thallus *Coenogonii*." No species were mentioned. So it would seem that Fries did not definitely accept the genus at that time and hence did not validly publish the name (Art. 43). In Fries's index the name *Dichonema* is printed in italics and in this way treated by himself as a synonym! — VARIANT SPELLING. In Blume & Nees's text one finds the denomination *Dichonemia*, but the accompanying plate bears that of *Dichonema;* the latter spelling is the preferable one as was already remarked by Hariot (*in* Bull. Soc. mycol. France 7: 32. 1891). — TYPONYMS: *Dictyonema* C. Agardh apud Kunth (1822) and *Laudatea* Johow (1884). — STARTING-POINT DATE: 1753.

Dichonemia.—See *Dichonema*.

Dictyonema C. Agardh *apud* Kunth, Syn. Pl. coll. Humb. & Bonpl. 1: 1. 1822; Syst. Algar. xxvi, 85. 1824. — ETYMOLOGY: *δίκτυον*, network; *νῆμα*, spinning, thread. Gender: n. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species):

[1] In Uppsala there are two specimens (apparently originally united) with the following labels: "Halte ich für eine neue Gattung / *Dichonemia* m.," presumably written by Nees, and "*Cilicia aeruginosa* Fries S. O. V.," in Fries's handwriting.

Dictyonema excentricum C. Agardh apud Kunth = *Dictyonema sericeum* (Fr.) Mont. — REMARK. "*Dictyonema* (Ag.) Zahlbr. . . . 1907," with "*D. membranaceum* Ag." as type species, of Clements & Shear (Gen. of Fungi 344. 1931), is apparently the same genus. "*D*[*ictyonema*]*? membranaceum*" was added to the genus by Agardh in 1824, as a doubtful species. — HOMONYM: *Dictyonema* Reinsch (1874-75; Deuteromycetes). — TYPONYMS: *Dichonema* Blume & Th. Nees (1826) and *Laudatea* Johow (1884). — STARTING-POINT DATE: 1753.

Gyrolophium G. Kunze *ex* Krombh., Naturg. Abb. Beschr. Schw. Hft. 2: 76. 1831. — Etymology: γυρός, round; λοφία, crest. Gender: n. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species): *Gyrolophium elegans* G. Kunze ex Krombh. = *Cora pavonia* (Sw.) Fr. = *Cora montana* (Sw.) Santesson; compare Zahlbruckner (Cat. Lichen. univ. 7: 744. 1931). — PROTONYM. The generic name was first used in connection with herbarium-specimens.[2] Reichenbach (Consp. Reg. veg. 14. 1828), moreover, mentioned it, as a nomen nudum, in a list of genera as "*Gyrolophium* Kz. ined. exot." — TYPONYMS: *Cora* Fr. (1825) and compare *Cilicia* Fr. (1825) and *Wainiocora* Tomaselli (1950). — STARTING-POINT DATE: 1753.

Herpothallon F. Tobler *in* Flora 131: 446. 1937. — Etymology ἕρπω, I creep; θαλλός, thallus. Gender: n. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species): *Chiodecton sanguineum* (Sw.) Wainio. — TYPONYM: *Hypochnus* Fr. ex Ehrenb. (1822), q.v. — STARTING-POINT DATE: 1753.

Hypochnus Fr. *ex* Ehrenb. *in* Nees Horae phys. berolin. 84. 1820. — ETYMOLOGY: ὑπό, under; χνόος, fine down. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Hypochnus rubrocinctus* Ehrenb.—This species is now considered to belong to *Chiodecton sanguineum* (Sw.) Wainio: compare Zahlbruckner (Cat. Lichen. univ. 2: 497. 1923). — SCOPE. Ehrenberg included two species, *Hypochnus rubrocinctus* (first species) and *H. nigrocinctus* Ehrenb., both depicted. — VALID PUBLICATION. Ehrenberg (Sylv. mycol. berolin. 12. 1818) first used the generic name as a nomen nudum in a list of fungi: "*Hypochnus* Fries"—nothing else. It was validly published in 1820 (*l.c.*) in an annotation to *Hypochnus rubrocinctus:*

"Notandum est, quod hocce genus, a Clariss. Fries constitutum, iure suo locum in Systemate sibi vindicare videatur; verum nullo pacto cum auctore eius, de fungis

[2] A specimen in the Herbarium at Uppsala bears on its label the following text written in ink by hand: "*Gyrolophium mauritianum* Kunze / Ex Insula Mauritii / (Sieber Plantae cryptog. exot. No. 65.)," another in the Kew Herbarium is labeled also in ink by hand: "65. *Gyrolophium mauritianum* Kunze. Mauritius." Pfeiffer (Nomencl. bot. 1: 1537. 1874) cited: "Sieb. Crypt. exsicc. Nr 62." Typonym: *Cora gyrolophia* Fr., Epicr. 556. 1838.

meritissimo, Thelephoris hoc prope adposuerim, sed quam maxime ab illis remotum genus *Sporotrichorum* finibus addico. . . . Hypochni sunt enim Sporotricha, Thelephoras mentientia, quod vice versa dici nequit, quoniam ascidia et thecae, . . . Thelephoras constituentes, desunt. Atylosporia (Link) media sunt inter Sporotricha et Hypochnos."—Ehrenberg (*l.c.*, 1820).

What can be extracted from this observation as a (differential) description is meagre indeed, but just sufficient: it says that *Hypochnus* differs from *Thelephora* because it lacks "ascidia" and "thecae," characteristic of the latter genus. — TYPIFICATION. Donk (*in* Bull. bot. Gdns Buitenzorg III 17: 190. 1941) selected *H. rubrocinctus* as the type species.[3] — HOMONYM: *Hypochnus* Fr. (Obs. mycol. 2: 278. 1818) *ex* Fr., Syst. mycol. 1: 450. 1821 (in an observation under "*Thelephora* XII. C. *Himantia.* Fries").—This name will be fully treated in a subsequent part of the present series ("Thelephoraceae"). *Hypochnus* as published by Ehrenberg might be interpreted as a mere (mis)application of this earlier name (which was not yet validly published when Ehrenberg's publication appeared) or as a homonym. In both cases it would appear to be validly published as the name of a lichen genus. — REMARK. If the above conclusions are deemed acceptable, *Hypochnus* Fr. ex Ehrenb. has to be considered a priorable name, as it was validly published at an earlier date than *Hypochnus* Fr. ex Fr. (1821). — TYPONYM. As a consequence *Herpothallon* F. Tobler, based on the same species, would become a later typonym, to be replaced by *Hypochnus* Ehrenb. — STARTING-POINT DATE: 1753.

Laudatea Johow *in* Jb. wiss. Bot. 15: 398. 1884. — ETYMOLOGY: Laudat, the name of a mulatto family in Dominica. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species): *Laudatea caespitosa* Johow.[4]—Now considered to be a mere form of *Dichonema sericeum* (Fr.) Mont. — TYPONYMS: *Dictyonema* C. Agardh apud Kunth (1822) and *Dichonema* Blume & Th. Nees (1826). — STARTING-POINT DATE: 1753.

Rhipidonema Mattirolo *in* Nuov. Giorn. bot. Ital. 13: 265. 1881. — Etymology: ῥιπις, small fan; νῆμα, spinning, thread. Gender: n. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species): *Cora ligulata* Krempelhuber. — STARTING-POINT DATE: 1753.

---

[3] A specimen, labelled by Ehrenberg, is preserved in Persoon's herbarium at Leyden. Another specimen bearing this name and the indication "Ehrenb. n. 81 . . ." is preserved in the Uppsala Herbarium.

[4] What appears to be a portion of the type collection at Uppsala is labelled, "*Laudatea caespitosa* Johow / Legit Fr. Johow in insula Dominica prope Laudat habitationem 1883."

Wainiocora Tomaselli *in* Archivio bot., Forli **26** (2): 8 (reprint pagination). 1950; *in* Rev. bryol. lichén. II **20**: 213. 1951. — ETYMOLOGY: E. Au. Wainio (Vainio); the genus *Cora*. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species): *Wainiocora ciferrii* Tomaselli.—Dr. R. Santesson (oral communication) thinks this might well be a synonym of *Cora pavonia* (Sw.) Fr. = *C. montana* (Sw.) Santesson.